



0000131466

**BEFORE THE ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION**

RENZ D JENNINGS  
CHAIRMAN  
MARCIA WEEKS  
COMMISSIONER  
CARL J KUNASEK  
COMMISSIONER

Oct 26 12 12 PM '96

IN THE MATTER OF THE PETITION OF TCG ) DKT NO U-3016-96-402  
PHOENIX FOR ARBITRATION PURSUANT TO ) DKT NO E-1051-96-402  
§252(B) OF THE TELECOMMUNICATIONS )  
ACT OF 1996 TO ESTABLISH AN INTER- )  
CONNECTION AGREEMENT WITH US WEST )  
COMMUNICATIONS, INC )

**COMMENTS OF SPRINT ON ARBITRATOR'S RECOMMENDATION**

Sprint Communications Company L P submits the following comments on the  
October 21, 1996, recommendations of the Arbitrator in the above captioned matter

Sprint believes that with regard to the vast majority of the issues, the Arbitrator's  
recommended decisions are reasonable and sound interpretations and applications of the  
federal Telecommunications Act of 1996 ("Act"). Due to the press of other business,  
Sprint will limit its comments to one issue of vital importance to Sprint, where it believes  
that the recommendation is erroneous. However, Sprint does disagree with other aspects  
of the recommendations and it should not be inferred that Sprint agrees with the  
recommended decisions in all other respects because of the absence of comments on them

The Arbitrator's recommended decision on issue 10(a), "Most Favorable Terms  
and Treatment suggests that a "most favored nation" provision will not be required for  
inclusion in the interconnection agreement because "We do not desire to subject US West  
to a most favored nations provision beyond that required by the Act." Sprint is not certain  
what that statement was intended to suggest but believes that the failure to require a MNF

provision in the interconnection agreement is erroneous and should not be adopted by the Commission.

The recommended language could be read to suggest that the Act does not require MFN treatment in the same manner as required by the FCC and presumably reflected in TCG's proposed provision. If so, the recommended decision does not indicate the basis for such a conclusion other than to note the 8th Circuit Court stay of the FCC rules. However, that Court action should not be relied on for such a conclusion. First, of course, the Court stay was simply a preliminary decision based on the Court's "first look" at the issues, pending a full decision on the merits which will reportedly occur next year. Even that temporary "stay" is subject to review by the United States Supreme Court. Furthermore, it is evident from even a cursory reading of the stay order that the Court did make a fully considered decision regarding the FCC's "pick and choose" rule. Instead, that issue was overshadowed by the principle issue regarding the FCC's authority to promulgate "pricing" rules. Clearly, there is no definitive judicial decision on the interpretation of §252(i) of the Act, and the Commission should not suggest otherwise.

Most importantly, the Court's "first look" at the MFN issue resulted in an erroneous understanding of the Act and the purpose and nature of its nondiscrimination provisions. The requirements of §251(i) - to make available any interconnection, service, or network element contained in an approved agreement to any other carrier upon the same terms and conditions - must be interpreted in light of other provisions of the Act. §251(c)(2)(d) of the Act requires that incumbent Local Exchange Carriers (ILECs) must provide interconnection "on rates, terms and conditions that are just, reasonable and nondiscriminatory." As noted by the FCC, this "nondiscrimination" provision is unlike

§202 of the Communications Act of 1934 (and unlike most state statutes) in that it does not only prohibit "undue" or "unreasonable" discrimination but prohibits any discrimination. Congress, in imposing such an absolute standard, clearly recognized that the Act's goal of promoting development of local exchange service competition could only be achieved if all new entrants were treated equally by ILECs so that no entrant was provided a preference through unequal terms and conditions of interconnection. Such equal availability of interconnection terms and conditions, of course, includes rates and prices. Although the 8th Circuit's initial decision appears to find that "rates" are not "terms and conditions," it would make no sense to prohibit discrimination for "non-rate" terms and conditions but allow it for "rate" terms and conditions. Clearly, the rates for the various components of interconnection agreements are the most critical factors in ensuring that all new entrants have non-discriminatory opportunities to compete.

Furthermore, the nondiscrimination mandate of the Act means that the individual components of interconnection agreements, and not just an entire agreement, must be available. As the FCC recognized, the Congressional intent is evident from the fact that §252(i) makes a distinction between "any interconnection, service or network element" and an entire interconnection agreement. If Congress had meant to only require the nondiscriminatory availability of entire agreements, there would have been no need to include the words "interconnection, service or network element" in the provision.

The availability of individual components of an agreement is necessary to prevent discrimination by the ILECs as they resist the development of competition. As suggested by the FCC, without the "pick and choose" interpretation, the ILECs could use their greater bargaining power to insert in one agreement onerous provisions, which do not

affect that particular new entrant, in order to discourage other new entrants from requesting interconnection under the same terms and conditions.

Thus, in agreeing with ILEC arguments that the FCC's interpretation of §252(i) interfered with the Act's mandate for negotiated or arbitrated interconnection agreements, the 8th Circuit appears to have ignored the Act's provisions which prohibit discrimination in interconnection, services and network elements. Although the Act clearly does mandate negotiations and arbitrations as a process for achieving interconnection agreements, it also just as clearly prohibits discrimination with regard to each element of those agreements. Sprint suggests that the two are not irreconcilable, as the 8th Circuit Court has apparently concluded. The FCC "pick and choose" rule would still permit parties to negotiate individual agreements, but would simply help prevent the ILECs from entering into discriminatory agreements. This Commission should therefore not make the same mistake as made by the 8th Circuit and should adopt the FCC's reasoning as its own in finding that TCG (and other new entrants) do indeed have rights to nondiscriminatory treatment by US West with regard to every element and component of its interconnection agreement.

It may be that the recommended decision was not intended to suggest disagreement with TCG's (and the FCC's) interpretation of the Act's MFN provision; but was meant only to find that a most favored nation (MFN) provision should not be required to be explicitly included in the interconnection since it would be redundant with rights granted by the Act. Such a finding by the Commission would not clearly inform interested parties of the Commission's interpretation of this provision of the Act. Given the uncertainty already created by the 8th Circuit's actions, Sprint respectfully suggests

that the Commission should ensure that the parties to an interconnection agreement are clearly aware of their MFN rights, by mandating a provision in the interconnection agreement which does spell out those rights.

Respectfully submitted,  
Sprint Communications Company L.P.



Donald A. Low  
8140 Ward Parkway SE  
Kansas City, MO 64114  
(913) 624-6865  
Fax (913) 624-5681

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

The undersigned hereby certifies that the foregoing was served by sending, by facsimile, a copy thereof to the following on this 21<sup>st</sup> day of October, 1996.

Gary Lane  
Counsel  
US West Communications  
5090 N. 40th St., Ste. 425  
Phoenix, AZ 85018

Deborah Waldbaum  
Teleport Communications Group  
Western Region Office  
201 North Civic Dr., Ste. 210  
Walnut Creek, CA 94596





External Affairs  
8140 Ward Parkway, 5E  
Kansas City, MO 64114  
(913) 624-6865  
Fax: (913) 624-5681  
Departmental Line: (913) 624-6819

**TELECOPY COVER SHEET**

DATE:

10-18-96

TO: James Matthews / HCC

FAX #: 632 442-44-3

TO: Deborah Williams

FAX #: 632 943-1111

TO: Gary Lane

FAX #: 632 212-9447

TO: \_\_\_\_\_

FAX #: \_\_\_\_\_

TO: \_\_\_\_\_

FAX #: \_\_\_\_\_

TO: \_\_\_\_\_

FAX #: \_\_\_\_\_

TO: \_\_\_\_\_

FAX #: \_\_\_\_\_

TO: \_\_\_\_\_

FAX #: \_\_\_\_\_

TO: \_\_\_\_\_

FAX #: \_\_\_\_\_

FROM: Don Low

Number of Pages: 6  
(incl. cover sheet)

COMMENTS: \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

PROBLEMS WITH TRANSMISSION? CALL: Rhonda McLearen (913) 624-6837

RECEIVED  
AZ CORP COMMISSION

**PROPOSED AMENDMENT NO. 2**

OCT 29 9 36 AM '96

COMPANY: TCG Phoenix and  
US West Communications, Inc.

AGENDA NO.: U-5

DOCUMENT CONTROL

DOCKET NO.: U-3016-96-402 and  
E-1051-96-402

OPEN MEETING DATE: October 29, 1996

PREPARED BY: Scott S. Wakefield, Hearing Officer

**Performance Standards**

Page 15, Lines 22-25:

DELETE: "U S WEST shall provision, install, maintain, repair and monitor all services, interconnection facilities, unbundled elements, collocation elements, and all other interconnection arrangements, facilities and services ordered by TCG, to at least the same level of quality which U S WEST provides to itself and in compliance with any quality of service requirements imposed by the Commission."

INSERT: "We adopt the measurements proposed by TCG on which to gauge U S WEST's performance. However, we find pursuant to the Act, that the proper standard of performance should be the quality of service which U S WEST provides to itself, to other CLECs, or other quality of service requirements imposed by the Commission, whichever is highest."

Page 16, Line 4: INSERT new paragraph:

" The Commission has rendered its Decision regarding the parties to this arbitration proceeding. Nothing in this Decision shall be considered to prejudice the outcome of the Commission's Decision in any other arbitration proceeding regarding U S WEST's performance standards or the applicability of penalties."

TCG  
Amendment  
no

SECRET

**AGENDA NO.: U-5**

**OPEN MEETING DATE: October 29, 1996**

**PREPARED BY: Scott S. Wakefield, Hearing Officer**

RECEIVED  
AZ CORP COMMISSION  
OCT 29 9 48 AM '96  
SECURITY CONTROL

## Performance Standards

**Page 15, Lines 22-25:**

**DELETE** "U S WEST shall provision, install, maintain, repair and monitor all services, interconnection facilities, unbundled elements, collocation elements, and all other interconnection arrangements, facilities and services ordered by TCG, to at least the same level of quality which U S WEST provides to itself and in compliance with any quality of service requirements imposed by the Commission."

**INSERT**      “We adopt the measurements proposed by U S WEST in its Best and Final Offer submitted in *The Matter of the Petition of AT&T Communications of the Mountain States, Inc. for Arbitration with U S West Communications, Inc. of Terms and Conditions Pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 252(b) of the Telecommunications Act of 1996*, Docket No. U-2428-96-417 et al., as the proper measurement on which to gauge U S WEST’s performance. We find that pursuant to the Act, the proper standard of performance for each of those measurements should be the quality of service which U S WEST provides to itself, to other CLECs, or other quality of service requirements imposed by the Commission, whichever is higher.”

**Page 16, Line 4:      INSERT new paragraph:**

**" The Commission has rendered its Decision regarding the parties to this arbitration proceeding. Nothing in this Decision shall be considered to prejudge the outcome of the Commission's Decision in any other arbitration proceeding regarding U S WEST's performance standards or the applicability of penalties."**

U.S. West  
Amendment  
3-0  
moved

crenquage adu



**PROPOSED AMENDMENT NO. 1**

**COMPANY:** TCG Phoenix and  
US West Communications, Inc.

**AGENDA NO.:** U-5

**DOCKET NO.:** U-3016-96-402 and  
E-1051-96-402

**OPEN MEETING DATE:** October 29, 1996

**PREPARED BY:** Scott S. Wakefield, Hearing Officer

RECEIVED  
AZ CORP COMMISSION  
Oct 29 9 48 AM '96  
DOCUMENT CONTROL

**Trunking to End Offices**

**Page 5, Lines 20-21:**

**DELETE:** "TCG has agreed to direct local traffic away from the access tandems and trunk directly to the end office when traffic reaches a particular level."

**INSERT:** "TCG proposed to create separate local interconnection trunk groups which can be directly trunked by U S WEST to the end offices, without the need for any tandem switching, when traffic reaches 512 ECCS."

**Page 6, Lines 9-10:**

**DELETE:** "We will also expect TCG to trunk directly to the end offices when traffic reaches a reasonable level."

**INSERT:** "We will also expect TCG to deliver end-office traffic to the point of interconnection between U S WEST's and TCG's networks on separate trunk groups when traffic reaches 512 ECCS, thereby allowing U S WEST to route this traffic directly to the end office without the need for any tandem switching."

**Combination Interconnection Trunk Groups**

**Page 7, Line 21:**

**INSERT:** " If local and toll traffic are combined in one trunk group, TCG must provide a measure of the amount of local and toll traffic relevant for billing purposes to U S WEST. U S WEST will be allowed to audit the traffic reported if it has reason to believe the reported measurement is not accurate."

3-0  
moved

"Make-ready" charges for Conduit

Page 16, Line 16:

INSERT: "Where U S WEST is permitted to charge a "make ready" charge up front, the "make ready" charge shall be subject to refund by U S WEST as set forth in TCG's proposal with respect to the refunding of a proportionate share of infrastructure charges paid for physical collocation."

Customer Transfer Charge

Page 19, Line 22:

INSERT: "We will further permit TCG to demonstrate what its own costs will be upon termination of a resale customer, so that amount may be discounted from the customer transfer charge payable to U S WEST."

Most Favored Nations

Page 23, Line 18:

INSERT: "The Commission has rendered its Decision regarding the parties to this arbitration proceeding. Nothing in this Decision shall be considered to prejudge the outcome of the Commission's Decision in any other arbitration proceeding regarding the applicability or interpretation of the Most Favored Nation Clause."